



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

original. Of equal, if not greater, importance is the evidence now laid before the world of biblical scholarship by the publication of the Washington Manuscripts of both Old and New Testaments in the Græek.

The four biblical manuscripts were bought by Mr. Charles L. Freer, of Detroit, Michigan, of an Arab dealer named Ali in Gizeh, near Cairo, on December 19, 1906, after they had previously been considered by other purchasers, including representatives of the British Museum. The most important are the two published in 1910 and 1912 respectively in collation, with full and scholarly introduction and illustrative plates, by Professor Sanders, of the University of Michigan. The introduction to the manuscript of Deuteronomy and Joshua discusses its history, palaeography, contents and text problem. Professor Sanders dates it "not later than the fifth century", and considers its text comparable in value to that of Alexandrinus (A). The Introduction to the Gospels manuscript (W), after discussion of its history, palaeography, contents and text problem, fixes its date as probably within the limits of the fourth century, "though the beginning of the fifth must still be admitted as a possibility. The first quire of John is slightly older than the rest of the MS". Its text is most nearly related to that employed by Origen, as appears from the discussion entitled The Text of W and the Early Church Fathers, and will rank henceforth as a witness to the original not far behind the great uncials cherished in the homes of the Roman, Greek and Anglican succession.

Thanks and congratulations are due from the entire world of biblical scholarship, but especially from its American contingent, both to Mr. Freer and to Professor Sanders.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

B. W. BACON.

CORRESPONDENCE

In reviewing in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6.94-95 the edition of Cicero by Messrs. Gunnison and Harley, Mr. Bernard M. Allen calls attention to several errors overlooked in proof reading, for which courtesy the authors are grateful: 67 for 66 (p. xix), *nostrum* for *nostrum* (page 189, line 106), *infero* for *indico* (353), *whom* for *who* (325). There are also one or two cases of seeming inconsistency.

Other criticisms, however, have not been so well established, and the authors, if sinning, are in most excellent company.

If it is "wasting space" to translate *industriarum subsidia* (page 208), at least four other commentators in recent editions have thought it wise to waste the same amount.

For *quamquam* the meaning 'and yet', which is new to pupils in Cicero, has been given once for each of the orations against Catiline. But of such generosity the authors stubbornly refuse to repent.

"The subjunctive by attraction", says Mr. Allen, "is badly overworked". There are nine subjunctives so explained in the six orations: *deferrem* (Cat. 2.3), *faceret* (Cat. 3.4), *si quid . . . esset* (Cat. 3.8), *sciret* (Cat. 3.8), *gesserim* (Cat. 3.29), *decerit*

(Cat. 4.10), *potuisset* (M.L. 9), *ventum sit* (M.L. 37), *agerentur* (Arch. 18).

Deferrem is subjunctive by dependence upon *crederent*, and not because of *putatis*, which might be omitted. Hence the mood of *deferrem* is due to attraction, and not to indirect discourse. In *quae gesserim*, *quae* is not interrogative: the orator did not question what he had done. Then it must be relative, and the mood must be due to association with *meminerim*.

For several of the other verbs the alternate possibility of implied indirect discourse is admitted, but "it is often difficult to distinguish between Informal Indirect Discourse and the Integral Part. . . . The difficulty of making the distinction. . . is evidence of the close relationship between these two constructions". (So Allen and Greenough, 593, a, Note 2).

In the foot-notes to the Marcellus oration seven words are said to have been unnecessarily defined. They look familiar to an older mind, but five of them (*sollicitudine*, *domina*, *adfirmo*, *commemorabile*, *fortuitum*) are not found in High School Latin previously read (see Lodge's Vocabulary). Would many pupils be likely to guess 'fortuitous'? The two other words, *pertinacia* and *sanitatis*, are found only once in earlier reading, and then as far back as Caesar Book I.

If the phrases *a abhorre* (p. 282), *a aliena* (p. 283), *de sumpserit* (p. 236) are "un-Latin", the responsibility seems to be upon Cicero. The text is quoted intentionally without change of order and without including words not to be defined.

"The student is instructed to use *omnibus* in the dative in the sense of everything", says the reviewer. This is intended to apply to a composition sentence on page 357 which reads: "Even many senators did not believe all (neut. pl.) that I said". It will be noticed that in the book no mention is made of *omnibus*, nor of the "dative", nor of "everything". Mr. Allen evidently assumes that the verb requires *omnibus*, which of course would be ambiguous in gender and therefore ungrammatical. But *credo* here requires *omnia*, and thus makes the sentence harmless.

"It is doubtful to no one that the general is pre-eminent" is cited as an "unpolished" translation. But if reference is made to page 259, line 527, be the first nine words of the quotation seem to be the reviewer's, not the note-writer's. The remaining phrase, "is pre-eminent", ought to stand as a fair equivalent of *plurimum possit* in M.L., Chapter 15.

In "the dative with personal nouns" (App. 118), Mr. Allen has misread "of" for "with". The dative "with" is different from the dative "of". This explains his misunderstanding of *portis*, the dative with the personal noun *custos*, in *nullus est portis custos* (compare Hale-Buck, 363, b).

Isn't it a bit hypercritical to attack "the ablative of comparison following a comparative adjective"? Grammarians who use this expression (Allen and Greenough, Harkness, Hale-Buck, Burton) do not mean "following" in a physical sense, but as equivalent to "associated with".

The illustration of *accidit quod*, which the reviewer says would seem in order, is: *accidit perincommode quod nusquam vidisti*, Att. 1.17.2 (Gildersleeve-Lodge, 525). The note on page 383 of the Cicero clearly states that *ut* is the usual connective.

"The present infinitive denotes the same time as the principal verb" is meant to be the rule in its simplest form, as it is generally accepted, and not to cover exceptions.

W. S. HARLEY.

ERASMUS HALL HIGH SCHOOL, Brooklyn.

A number of these points involve questions of judgment, where the main facts are in the possession of the reader, who can thus easily decide between author and reviewer. Moreover, it is the latter's privilege occasionally to criticize common errors, and not to confine himself to those peculiar to the book reviewed. I must, therefore, continue to believe, not that it is a waste of time to translate *industriæ subsidia*, for that statement was not made, but that it is a waste of time to translate it by "aids of industry", the one translation most students would be sure to make, and generally without looking up the words. This and similar opinions, however, I should not think of trying to establish by irrefutable evidence.

The question of the subjunctive of attraction must also remain a matter of opinion. If this somewhat mechanical explanation is preferred for subordinate clauses in indirect requests and commands (as *sciret*, above), and in indirect questions (as *ventum sit*), instead of the much more fundamental and common principle of informal indirect discourse, there is no proof to the contrary. There are even commentaries of recent date who think that the infinitive with *iubeo* attracts its subordinate clause into the subjunctive. *Decrerit*, above, is quite clearly a characteristic subjunctive, as well as subordinate to an indirect question (introduced by *quid*). *Agerentur* is subordinate to *dicere*, which is dependent on *vidi*.

The statement in regard to "*omnibus* in the dative", condensed as it was, may have been somewhat misleading, and *credo* here does indeed require *omnia*, though this accusative with *credo*, in the sense of 'give credence to', does not occur in Caesar or in the Cicero usually read. The criticism, however, was directed, not at the requirement, but at the instructions. The student is instructed to use the neuter plural (of *omnis*) for 'all', in the sense of 'everything', and the only direction to be found anywhere in this book in regard to the case is what is given in App. 112. b, where *mihi credite* illustrates the usual rule for the dative with verbs of believing, etc.

Careless misreading was responsible for the comment on the "dative with personal nouns", and due apologies are hereby tendered.

Of the 212 present infinitives in Books III and IV of the Gallic War, 79 are in indirect discourse, and refer generally to the same time as the principal verb. The remaining 133 are in other constructions where the infinitive has no tense force, and, when it does refer to the same time as the principal verb, does so accidentally, as a relative may agree with its antecedent in case. Of the 79 indirect discourse infinitives, seven are cases of *posse* with a future significance. The "exceptions" here seem to have the best of it, and, if it was the general purpose of the authors to avoid a statement covering the really rare exceptions, where does *accidit quod* come in (especially if this combination is to be justified only by an example from Cicero's letters)?

It surely would have been a most serious offense to blame the authors for writing "it is doubtful to no one that the general is preëminent", if they really had not done so. On the other hand it does not seem quite courteous or wise for them to suggest that the reviewer was guilty of such a transgression, when a very little effort on their part, even if memory failed, would have discovered the offending sentence in its entirety under the *quin* constructions in App. 205, e.

PHILLIPS ACADEMY, Andover.

BERNARD M. ALLEN.

ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS¹

The Times (London), Literary Supplement—Feb. 28, Demosthenes and Athens (Pickard-Cambridge's translation of the Public Orations); March 21, The Poet of Assisi (Butler's and Phillimore's translations of Propertius).

The Times (London), Educational Supplement—Nov. 5, The Pronunciation of Latin, J. P. Postgate and J. Sergeant: (W. H. S. Jones, Classics and the direct Method); Dec. 3, The Pronunciation of Latin, E. Myers; Jan. 7, The Classics in Education: Humanism and Literary Values, W. Rhys Roberts: The Pronunciation of Latin; Feb. 4, The Pronunciation of Latin: The Cambridge Greek Testament: (W. H. S. Jones and R. B. Appleton, Perse Latin Plays).

Yale Review—April, An Athenian Critic of Life, T. D. Goodell.

Westminster Review—April, Learning in Ancient Ireland and the Part Played by Virgilius Grammaticus, H. M. Strong.

The Anabasis is an admirable work of art, unique in its combination of concise and rapid narrative with colour and picturesqueness. . . . Xenophon . . . created the historical romance. What a world of wonders in this little book, all aglow with ambitions and conflicts, with marvels of strange lands; full of perils and rescues, fresh with the air of mountain and of sea! Think of it for a moment by the side of Caesar's Commentaries; not to compare things incomparable, but in order to appreciate the perfect art which shines through Xenophon's mastery of language, his brevity achieving a result so different from that of the like characteristic in the Roman writer. Caesar's conciseness comes of strength and pride; Xenophon's, of a vivid imagination. Many a single line of the Anabasis presents a picture which deeply stirs the emotions. A good instance occurs in the fourth book, where a delightful passage of unsurpassable narrative tells how the Greeks rewarded and dismissed a guide who had led them through dangerous country. The man himself was in peril of his life; laden with valuable things which the soldiers, had given him in their gratitude, he turned to make his way through the hostile region. 'When evening came, he took leave of us, and went his way by night'. To my mind, words of wonderful suggestiveness. You see the wild, eastern landscape, upon which the sun has set. There are the Hellenes, safe for the moment on their long march, and there the mountain tribesman, the serviceable barbarian, going away, alone, with the tempting guerdon, into the hazards of the darkness.

Also in the fourth book, another picture moves one in another way. Among the Carduchian Hills two men were seized, and information was sought from them about the track to be followed. 'One of them . . . kept silence in spite of every threat; so, in the presence of his companion, he was slain. Thereupon that other made known the man's reason for refusing to point out the way; in the direction the Greeks must take there dwelt a daughter of his, who was married'.

It would not be easy to express more paths than is conveyed in these few words. Xenophon himself, one may be sure, did not feel it quite as we do, but he preserved the incident for its own sake, and there, in a line or two, shines something of human love and sacrifice, significant for all time.

From George Gissing: The Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft (Summer, ix).

¹ For the significance of the forms adopted in making the entries see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6.39. Valuable assistance has again been rendered by Professor H. H. Yeames, Mr. Irving Demarest, and Mr. W. S. Messer.